

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 8 is amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. In addition, the title is amended and typographical errors in the drawings are corrected. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is requested to consider the information submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed on January 31, 2006. The Examiner is requested to return an initialed PTO-1449 with the next Patent Office communication.

II. All Informalities Have Been Corrected

By this Amendment, typographical informalities have been corrected in the drawings. In particular: (i) the spelling of "deleting" and "protected" in step S521 of Fig. 15 is corrected; (ii) the spelling of "termination" in step S22 of Fig. 19 is corrected; (iii) the spelling of "selection" in step S61 and "search" in step S69 of Fig. 26 is corrected; and (iv) the spelling of "enabling" in step S81, "changed" in step S86, "lapse of time" in step S88 and "change" in step S94 of Fig. 28 is corrected.

Applicants submit that the amendment to the title overcomes the objection to the title.

III. All Pending Claims Are Patentable

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 8 overcome this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,721,001 to Berstis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,075 to Niikawa. In addition, independent claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Niikawa in view of Berstis. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither Berstis nor Niikawa, singularly or collectively, discloses or suggests the combinations of features recited in the independent claims of this application. In particular, neither of the references discloses or suggests an arrangement in which a controller of a

digital image storage causes the taking out of digital images from a digital camera that is mounted on a docking station. The Office Action acknowledges that Berstis, while disclosing a docking station (cradle 106) for a digital camera 102, does not disclose the claimed controller of a digital image storage that causes the taking out of images from the digital camera 102. Berstis clearly teaches that the camera microprocessor 208 automatically transmits image data to an external computer when the camera 102 detects that power is being supplied to the camera 102, for example, through the cradle 106. See, for example, col. 4, lines 20-23, col. 4, lines 28-30 and col. 4, lines 53-56 of Berstis. Thus, Berstis does not disclose any device external from the camera that causes the taking out of images from the camera subsequent to receipt of a signal from the camera 102 or the cradle 106.

Niikawa does not overcome the deficiencies in Berstis described above. Niikawa discloses an arrangement in which a digital camera, after being coupled to a network, can control other devices on the network. At col. 7, lines 20-24, Niikawa discloses that a PC on a network detects a signal from a digital camera 1 after the digital camera is connected to the PC (for example, through a USB port). Once connected, the display on the PC and the display on the digital camera are made similar. See, for example, col. 7, lines 50-56. However, Niikawa does not disclose or suggest that the PC, subsequent to receiving the signal from the digital camera, causes the taking out of digital images from the camera. To the contrary, Niikawa explicitly discloses that the camera causes the transmission of images from the camera to external devices such as the PC by the user operating function keys F1-F3 on the camera. See, for example, col. 8, lines 37-64, col. 10, lines 4-15 and Fig. 2. Thus, even if combined, Berstis and Niikawa do not disclose or suggest the combinations of features recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 8-10 of this application.

While the Office Action refers to col. 1, line 65 - col. 2, line 26 of Niikawa for providing motivation to modify Berstis, the advantages (motivation) discussed in this portion

of Niikawa do not result from having the PC (one example of a digital image storage) cause a digital camera to transmit images to the PC. Accordingly, the Office Action's reliance on col. 1, line 65 - col. 2, line 26 is irrelevant to what Applicants are claiming in this application. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Berstis in view of Niikawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,099 to Davison et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to its independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachments:

Replacement Sheets

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 30, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461